

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-17 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, and 12 are independent. The remaining claims also depend, directly or indirectly, on independent claims 1, 8, and 12.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the claims contain subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s) had possession of the claimed invention at the time of filing the application. The Examiner addresses the “plurality of combinations between a location identifier and the URL (Uniform Resource Locator) of a web site providing a service for a purchase request of a consumable item used in the printer in the corresponding location” portion of claims 1 and 8, and deems that the aforementioned phrase was not properly identified or described in the original specification, and is, therefore, considered new subject matter. For at least the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Firstly, independent claim 12 does not recite the abovementioned phrase. Therefore, the rejection is inappropriate when applied to claim 12 and dependent claims thereof, viz. claims 13-16. Moreover, paragraph [0050] of the substitute specification filed May 27, 2008 clearly discloses, *inter alia*, “a plurality of combinations between a country identifier and a URL of the Web site providing a service for receiving a purchase request of ink cartridge in the corresponding country,”

and that “these combinations are created in advance by a developer of the printer utility program 90.” Therefore, the abovementioned portion of claims 1 and 8 do not constitute new subject matter. Dependent claims 2-7 and 9-11 also do not constitute new subject matter for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that claim 17 contains new subject in the form of “the receiving process obtains a country information set in an operating system, and displays a list of locations indicated in the obtained country information as a subject of selection before receiving a selection of the location where the printer is used.” For at least the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Paragraph [0050] of the substitute specification filed May 27, 2008 clearly recites a plurality of combinations between a country identifier and a URL of a Web site providing service for receiving a purchase request of ink cartridge in the corresponding country being recorded in an operation description file 92. Paragraph [0055] shows that the initial setting module 91 displays country identifiers (country names) recorded in the operation description file 92 in a selectable manner, before the user selects a country where the print system 1 is used. Thus, support for the abovementioned portion of claim 17 is available in the specification. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12-14, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,043,523 (“Haines et al.”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,494,562 (“Walker et al.”). For at least the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Haines et al. are directed to rendering assistance in replenishing consumables depleted by a computer peripheral device that communicates with a computer and is readily configured for use within network environments (*see, e.g.*, col. 1, lines 7-15). The consumable order-assistance system of Haines et al. enables a user to place an order of a consumable via a personal computer (PC) and the Internet with a reseller of the consumable (*see, e.g.*, col. 6, lines 33-36). With regard to independent claims 1, 8, and 12, the Examiner admits that Haines et al. do not show or suggest a storing process (*or* storing means as applied to claim 12) that stores a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) associated with a location in the received input, where URLs of web pages providing service for a purchase request of the consumable item and locations are associated with each other in advance, but cites Walker et al. as disclosing the same. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Although Walker et al. are directed to replaceable printing components, where a radio frequency link and a memory device are provided for receiving sales information of the printing component and storing the aforementioned sales information respectively (*see, e.g.*, col. 1, lines 19-24), Walker et al. are geared toward building brand loyalty by aiding in the selection of the best brand of the consumable/replaceable printing component for purchase (*see, e.g.*, col. 2, lines 12-18, and col. 10, lines 11-19). Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 34-43 of Walker et al. clearly disclose a *memory location* for storing component identifier information and reseller information, and Fig. 6 and col. 8, lines 40-57 clearly show that the reseller information may specify a URL that points to a reseller 68 or information that the customer may use to determine the reseller 68. The manufacturer 64, who writes the default information into the replaceable printing component 14, acts as the customer guide by providing the aforementioned URL. In view of Walker et al. not disclosing anything about locations, *i.e.*, country or area where a printer is used, akin to those recited in claims 1, 8, and 12,

and Walker et al. being geared toward building brand loyalty by enabling selection of the best brand of replaceable printing components, Walker et al. do not show or suggest at least a storing process (*or* storing means as applied to claim 12) that stores a URL associated with a location in the received input, where *URLs of web pages providing service for a purchase request of the consumable item and locations are associated with each other in advance.*

Thus, Haines et al. and Walker et al., whether considered separately or in combination, do not show or suggest all of the limitations of independent claims 1, 8, and 12. Independent claims 1, 8, and 12 are, therefore, patentable over Haines et al. and Walker et al. Claims 2-5, 7, 9, 11, 13-14, and 16, directly or indirectly dependent on claims 1, 8, and 12, are also patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 6, 10, 15, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haines et al. in view of Walker et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,065,497 ("Brewster et al."). For at least the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Haines et al. and Walker et al., as discussed above, do not show or suggest all of the limitations of independent claims 1, 8, and 12. The Examiner cites Brewster et al. as disclosing stored information containing, *inter alia*, an address, *i.e.*, state, city, country, and zip or postal code (*see* Office Action dated 9/18/2008, page 11). However, Brewster et al. clearly do not disclose listing of the aforementioned information and making the information user-selectable. Further, Brewster et al. also do not show or suggest acquisition of country information set in an operating system.

Thus, Brewster et al., like Haines et al. and Walker et al., do not show or suggest at least a storing process (*or* storing means as applied to claim 12) that stores a URL associated with a

location in the received input, where *URLs of web pages providing service for a purchase request of the consumable item and locations are associated with each other in advance*. Brewster et al. were cited by the Examiner as merely showing a document delivery system for providing a more detailed user (printer) profile (*see* Office Action dated 9/18/2008, pages 11 and 12). Independent claims 1, 8, and 12 are, therefore, patentable over Haines et al., Walker et al., and Brewster et al., whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 6, 10, 15, and 17 are also patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 17096/002001).

Dated: December 18, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
909 Fannin Street, Suite 3500
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant